UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

3,) C/A No. 4:24-0437-DCC-TER
Plaintiff,)
) ORDER
)
Defendants.)
	Plaintiff,

This is an action filed by a pretrial detainee. This case is before the Court due to Plaintiff's failure to comply with the magistrate judge's order, which included Plaintiff's failure to sign the Complaint and request available relief. (ECF No. 7). The order was not returned as undeliverable.

The mail in which the Order was sent to Plaintiff's provided address has not been returned to the court, thus it is presumed that Plaintiff received the Order, but has neglected to comply with the Order within the time permitted under the Order. The Court has not received a response from Plaintiff and the time for compliance has passed. A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge specifically informed Plaintiff that if Plaintiff failed to comply with the Order, this case would be subject to dismissal.

Plaintiff's lack of response to the Order indicates an intent to not prosecute this case, and subjects this case to dismissal. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)(district courts may dismiss an action if a Plaintiff fails to comply with an order of the court); see also Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989)(dismissal with prejudice appropriate where warning given); Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982)(court may dismiss sua sponte).

Accordingly, this case is dismissed without prejudice. The Clerk of Court shall close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Spartanburg, South Carolina April 26, 2024 s/Donald C. Coggins, Jr. United States District Judge